



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—On the Nominal Basis of the Hebrew Verb.

By CRAWFORD H. TOY,

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW IN THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

The object of this paper is to state what may be regarded as established concerning the Nominal Basis of the Hebrew Verb, to contribute something towards the solution of questions still undecided, and to inquire into the traces of nominal origin visible in the Syntax of the language.

There are certain quasi-verbal forms in Hebrew and the related languages, that are manifestly nominal. Such are Hebrew *yesh* or *ish* (יֵשׁ or יִשׁ), Aramaic *ithai*, *ith*, used as substantive verb, and the negatives Hebrew *ayin* (אֵין), Arabic *laisa*, *lâta*, Aramaic *laith*, *lêth*. *Yesh* is found once (Prov. viii. 21) as a substantive in the sense of ‘substance,’ *οὐσία*, and *yeshka* (יֵשְׁכָּא) may mean ‘thy being or existence’ = ‘thou art’: so ‘*od* (עוֹד) is a substantive, used adverbially, and acting as a verb when suffixes are attached to it; ‘*odi* ‘omed (עוֹדִי עוֹמֵד) ‘my continuance is standing’ = ‘I am still standing.’ Along with these may be probably put the so-called Arabic “Verbs of wonder.” Of these the form that takes an accusative after it is usually explained as the causative (IV.) of the verb, e. g. *ma ah.sanahu* ‘how goodly he is!’ literally, ‘what has made him goodly?’ But the diminutive form of this expression, *ma uhaisinahu* ‘how very goodly he is!’ clearly points to a substantival conception of it, the sense being: ‘What a beautifying of him!’ The other form also, *ahsin bi.hi*, commonly regarded as an imperative = ‘make him goodly!’ (i. e. ‘he is goodly’), is simply the noun, ‘goodliness in him!’ It is not surprising that the accusative suffixes are attached to the first form, since the same construction is found with the Nomen Verbi; we may regard this form as an old Nomen Verbi, identical with the present third singular masculine perfect of the causal, but dating from a time when the distinction between noun and verb did not exist. There are a few other Arabic forms which seem to point to a similar explanation.

The obviously Nominal Infinitive and Imperative may be passed by with a word. The former is in all respects treated as a simple substantive, taking suffixes freely, and also admitting variation of gender. The latter is peculiar only in that it has petrified certain affixes of gender and number, and these the same that appear in the verb, whence we may infer that at an early period the noun-forms divided themselves into two classes, of which one moved towards the fully developed form of the noun proper, the other towards that of the verb proper.

Coming, now, to the Perfect of the Simple Stem, the ground-form *katab* (*kataba*) is identical with the noun, and the inflection is purely nominal. The third person is without pronominal addition, probably because this was not needed for distinctness of reference after the other persons had been distinguished by such additions. The variations of gender and number are purely those of the noun: singular masculine *kataba* (Hebrew *kātab*), feminine *katabat* (Hebrew *kātebā*), plural masculine *katabū* (Hebrew *kātebū*), feminine *katab.na* (= *katabāna*, Aramaic *ketabēn*, *ketabā*, comp. the imperfect ending *ān*), dual masculine *katabā*, feminine *katabtā* (= *katabatū*). The second person has the pronominal affix, singular *ta*, *tī*, dual *tumā*, plural *tum*, *tunna* (Aramaic *tūn*, *tēn*, Hebrew *tem*, *ten*). The first person has singular *tu* (*tī*), plural *na* (*nu*). Here the general agreement between these affixes and the pronouns is too close to permit doubt of their identity, but a difficulty arises from the divergence of the initial letters of the two sets of forms, particularly when the Assyrian, Aethiopic, and Mehri dialects are taken into consideration. While the separate pronoun has *ta* in the second person, the noun has *ka*, and the Aethiopic has *ka* in the verb. On the other hand, while the separate first personal pronoun sounds *anokī* (Assyrian *anaku*), Arabic, Hebrew, Aramaic have *tu* or *tī* in the verb, and Assyrian and Aethiopic *ku*. What is the explanation of this seemingly arbitrary appearance of the *t* and *k* letters? The simplest way of escaping the difficulty would be to suppose a phonetic interchange of the two, the existence of which, however, in Shemitic is unproved, and its

laws here unexplained. Or it might be supposed that the original full pronouns contained both the letters (as, for example, second person *an.ta.ka*), from which the various dialects selected such parts as they preferred. This somewhat cumbersome hypothesis might derive a seeming support from the Egyptian second person pronoun singular masculine *ntek*, Coptic *entak*, but this combination of *t* and *k* is elsewhere lacking in Egyptian, and there is no indication of its existence in Shemitic. There is proof, however, that the demonstrative stems *ta*, *ha*, *sa*, *ka*, *na* are freely employed in Shemitic in a very general way for defining objects, and it is in accordance with what we know of the history of language to suppose that they were originally employed without distinction of person, the language gradually settling down on certain forms for certain personal distinctions.* Before the breaking up of the primitive Shemitic people, and before or along with the origination of the compound forms (*an.ta*, etc.), the *k*-stem (used also in some particles) was appropriated to the nominal suffixes of the second person, and by some languages to the verb also, while other languages (governed by considerations not yet known) chose the *t*-form for the verbal subject-affix. So in the first person, while *ni* or *i* was generally taken for the suffix, by some *tu* (*ti*), by others *ku* was chosen for the subject-affix of the verb. This view is not without its difficulties, since the reasons for the selection of one or another pronominal form are not given, but it seems open to fewer objections than any other. Not only in the simple stem but also in the derived stems the ground-forms are nouns, and most of them have their parallel forms in the substantives in common use. The principal varieties of stems are made by prefixing letters (*'a*, *ta*, *sa*, *na*) or by doubling consonants or broadening vowels within the stem, and these modes of formation are all found among substantives, though the verb has developed a greater freedom in this respect than the noun, by reason of the greater variety of aspects exhibited by it. With the intensive or Pael we may compare the large class of nouns (usually denoting occupations) that double the middle stem-

* Comp. Merx, *Grammatica Syriaca*, § 50.

letter; with the affective or Poel, the form of the active participle Qal; with the causal or Hiphil (Aphal) the intensive adjective used for comparative and superlative in Arabic; with Pael, the Arabic diminutive; and the prefixes *ta*, *sa*, *na* occur in the noun as well as in the verb. True, we cannot in all cases discover any close resemblance between the effects of these literal changes on the significations in noun and verb; but it is to be regarded as probable that these effects were at first very general and undefined, and only after a considerable time passed into the strict limits in which we now find them; moreover the verb-stems themselves show a somewhat wide range of meaning.

The Nominal origin of the base of the Imperfect is indicated in general by the modal terminations *u*, *a*, *an*, *i* (of which there remain in Hebrew only *an* in the cohortative and some suffix-forms, and traces of *i* in suffixes; as in the other Shemitic languages also, *i* has been generally dropped), which are identical with the case-endings of the noun. This identity is too exact to be explained as accidental, and the verb and the noun in their developed state differ from each other too much to allow the supposition of an imitation of one by the other. This remains true whether we can satisfactorily explain the modal significations of these terminations or not. On this point there is very general agreement. But there is great difference of opinion as to the origin of the existing forms. To begin with the third person. The old view that the prefix *ya* comes from the substantive verb *hawa* is now abandoned; though this might explain the meaning of the imperfect, *ya* could not be gotten from *wa*, and moreover the Syriac prefix *n* would be left unaccounted for. It is held by many that *ya* is from the third singular personal pronoun *hu.wa*. But similar objections lie against this view. There is no such masculine pronoun as *ya*, nor can this form be supposed to be a variation of *wa*, for, though Hebrew almost always changes initial *w* to *y*, this would not account for the appearance of *y* in Arabic, which finds no difficulty in an initial *w*; and, as above, we have here no explanation of the Syriac *n*. We are thus led to the supposition that the *y* (and so also the *n* of

Syriac) is a nominal formative, and the third person singular masculine of the imperfect a mere 'noun, precisely analogous in this respect to the corresponding person in the perfect. The nominal formation by prefixed *y* is not uncommon in the Shemitic languages. In Hebrew the majority of the examples are proper names, but there are not wanting common nouns, as *yīṣ.har* 'oil,' i. e., 'the shining (liquid).' The proper names were originally appellatives, and are in many cases obviously not imperfects of a verb, but simple nouns. So, many names of places, as *Yogbehah* (יִגְבָּהּ) 'height,' or 'high,' *Yāgur* (יָגוּר) 'sojourning-place,' the river *Yabboq* (יַבְבֹּק) 'the gushing stream,' *Yiphtah* (יִפְתָּח) 'the open place.' And, finding names that belong both to persons and to places, as *Yiphtah* and *Yābeṣ* (יָבֵס), we are justified in regarding the personal names also as true nouns, as *Yāaqob* (יַעֲקֹב) 'trickster or supplanter,' *Yuda* (*Yehuda*) 'praised,' *Yeroham* 'loved,' *Yezreel* 'God's sower,' *Yisrael* 'God's victory or prince.' It is also noteworthy that these nouns agree both in form and meaning with the imperfects of derived stems (chiefly Hiphil and Hophal) as well as of the simple stem (Qal): *Yoseph* and *Yabneh* are identical with Hiphil of *yasaph* and *bana*, *Yubal* and *Yudah* with Hophal of *yabal* and *yada*; the natural and sufficient explanation of which is that the derived stems were nouns and received the prefix *ya* (*yu*) just as the simple stem did. Alongside of *wasaph* (Hebrew *yasaph*) 'increaser' (*crescens*) was *awsaph* or *hawsaph* (Hebrew *hosiph* = *hosaph*, *hoseph*) 'causing to increase,' whence *ye.hoseph* = *yoseph* 'increaser'; from *hudah* (Hophal of *wadah*, Hebrew *yadah*) came *ye.hudah* = *yudah* (*laudatus*). So concrete nouns with prefix *m* (participles) follow the form of the derived stems, *maktib*, *muktāb*, etc.; and if the language had developed a verbal form from this noun (a *makteb*, *maktabta*, etc., 'he is causing to write, thou art causing to write,' etc.), we should have the true verb and the true noun standing alongside of one another, with the possibility of a free formation and use of both, long after the original signification and force of the prefix had been forgotten. The same thing may be true of the prefix *ya*, and we may therefore hold ourselves

justified in regarding the base of the Hebrew imperfect as a noun, along with the proper nouns* and common nouns above cited.

But besides this *y*, we find another preformative of the third singular masculine imperfect, the Syriac *n* (*nektub* = Hebrew *yiktob* = Arabic *yaktubu*), which cannot be from the substantive verb *hawa*, or from the personal pronoun *huwa*, but may be the element *n* (*an*) found in all the personal pronouns (Aramaic *in.hu*), which is a demonstrative, used also in nominal forms (taking the term demonstrative in a very general sense; without expressing an opinion as to the original form and meaning of the elements so designated); *nektub* (for *naktub*) would then be just such a noun as *yiktob* (for *yaktub*). No more satisfactory account of this prefix has been proposed, though it may not be possible to define the original force of the *na*. The most obvious point of comparison is with the Shemitic reflexive with the same prefix (Niphal), of which the meaning is: 'he acted on himself,' while the imperfect signifies: 'he set himself to act, entered on acting,' or, if we go back to the nominal form (in which the essential signification was doubtless already fixed), the Niphal *naqtal* = 'him killing,' 'one killing

* Among these is to be put the Hebrew quadriliteral divine name יהוה, which, like all other Shemitic names of the Deity, is to be regarded as an appellative. It is not easy, however, to fix its meaning. It stands almost alone; outside of Hebrew there is, as far as is now known, no divine name that resembles it. The Hebrew forms that come nearest to it are *Yeshu'* (יֵשׁוּעַ) and *Yehu'* (יְהוּא), made from the stems יָשַׁע and יָהוּא by the prefix *yē* = *yā*, and identical in form with the imperfect Qal (as בִּשַׁע from בֹּשַׁע); with יָהוּא compare יְהוֹ for יָהוּ (*Yeho* for *Yaho*) found as a component in proper names. The only vocalization that explains the forms of the quadriliteral given in the Old Testament is יְהוֹה *Yahwe* (from which *yāhu*, *yah*, *yeho* easily came), made from יהוה by prefix יָ, and signifying 'being' (Qal) or 'causing being' (Hiphil); the former was apparently the ancient Hebrew understanding of the name (Ex. iii. 14). As the stem *hawa*, though common in Aramaic and Arabic, is rare, almost obsolete in classic Hebrew (re-introduced at a later time by Aramaic influence), the name takes us back to an early time, perhaps before the separation of the Hebrew (Phenician-Canaanitish) from the parent stock. It was possibly an old Shemitic name, appropriated by the Hebrews in accordance with that higher conception of the Deity that seems to have belonged to them from the beginning, fixed as the national name by Moses (Ex. vi. 3), yielding at a later period (Ezra, Ecclesiastes) to the more generic term *Elohim*.

himself, the imperfect *naqtul* = 'he killing,' 'one proceeding to kill.' This makes the prefixes simple pronouns (not, however, signs of person), and is perhaps too general to be satisfactory; yet it is probable that these formatives were originally indefinite in meaning, and gradually settled into distinct shape, and it is possibly not accidental that the only Shemitic family that has no reflexive with prefix *n* is that which uses *n* as prefix of the imperfect. The two may, however, have arisen independently of each other, and the decision of this question does not affect the supposition of a nominal formative *n*, of which there are examples in Hebrew, as *ne.sibba* (11. Chr. x. 15) and perhaps *Neballât* (Neh. xi. 34), and in Aramaic, as *nebizba* (Dan. ii. 6).

To this account of the third person masculine imperfect it is objected that the other persons must then be formed on it as base, and we should have *ta.yaktulu*, etc., from which *taktulu* could come only either by the falling out of *y* and the coalescence of the two vowels, which ought to produce *â*, or by the falling away of the syllable *ya*, which, it is said, is improbable. But the coalescence of two vowels does not always produce a long vowel, as is clear from such forms as *kan.ta* for *kawanta* (from קָנָה); and the falling out of a syllable *yi* = *ya* seems actually to take place in the Biblical-Aramaic *leheweh* (לִּהְוֶה), if, as is probable, that is for *leyeheweh*. In the participle also (Hebrew *maktib* = *me.haktib*, Arabic *muktib* = *mu.aktib*) there is a disappearance in the Arabic of an *a* without trace. However, it is not necessary to suppose that the following forms are all based on the third person masculine; this is certainly not true of the third person feminine, and of the others it may be supposed that they are formed independently on the same base with the third person masculine. We come, then, to the other forms.

The prefix *ta* of the third singular feminine *ta.ktubu* (*tiktob*) is not a personal pronoun, for there is no feminine personal pronoun of this form. It may be the sign of the feminine, as in the noun and the perfect of the verb, or an independent nominal prefix. In spite of the plausibility of the former view, the analogy of the other persons seems to decide against

it. We could not say that it is impossible for a Shemitic noun to have the feminine sign prefixed (though there is no established case of such prefix), but it is obviously the method of the imperfect forms to affix the sign of gender, as in the second singular and third and second plural. If it be said that the feminine sign was prefixed because, if it had been affixed, there would have been no difference between perfect and imperfect, the answer is, that the analogy of the imperfect plural third feminine would lead us to expect not *katab.at* (it would, indeed, in any case be rather *ketubat* or *kutb.at*), but *yaktubat* (as *yaktubna*), without possibility of confusion with the perfect; and it is equally unsatisfactory to say that the feminine sign has been prefixed by imitation of the masculine third person, since the *ya* is not a sign of gender. Rather we have here an independent noun, made by prefix *ta* from the base *ktubu*. It is no doubt a serious difficulty in the way of this view that the nouns in common use made by this prefix are all masculine, except those that have the feminine *at* affixed, and it may be reasonably objected that we should at least expect the *i* at the end, as in the second person. But this difficulty seems less formidable than those that attach to the other views above mentioned. It is possible to suppose that such a noun as *taktubu*, originating at a time when genders were not yet definitely marked, came to be used for a feminine in accordance with the same general movement that later fixed *t* as a feminine termination.

The preformatives of the first and second person singular agree in form and meaning with the corresponding personal pronouns: *a* appears in Arabic *an.ā* (often *an.a* in poetry), Aethiopic *an.a*, Assyrian *an.a.ku*, Hebrew *āno.ki*; it is hardly from *an*, since there is no trace of an assimilation of *n*; *ta* in *an.ta* was a personal pronoun in the primitive Shemitic. It may be that these demonstrative elements were employed as prefixes before the personal significations were fixed, as in the perfect, and that they gradually acquired personal meaning as the separate pronouns were fixed. This would more easily accord with the fact that they are prefixed immediately to the base *ktubu* and not to *yaktubu*. As the two second persons

were not distinguished by the prefix, the feminine received the affix *i* (with an added demonstrative *n* in Arabic *ina*, Aramaic *in*), the origin of which is not to be sought in Hebrew *hi'*, Arabic *hi.ya* or *an.ti*, since it equally needs explanation there; but rather we must suppose that, after usage had selected such a form as *hi* or *ti* from the coexisting *hu*, *ha*, *hi* or *tu*, *ta*, *ti* as feminine, the letter *i* came to be identified with this gender (though not exclusively), and was employed to indicate it in the imperfect, where the prefix failed to make the necessary distinction. And since the prefix is *ta* and not *ti*, this indicates that the form *ta.ktubu* served at first equally for both genders, as in the Pentateuch the pronoun כָּהֵן (*hū'*) is both masculine and feminine. The mode of formation of the plural third person is somewhat different from that of the singular. The masculine, indeed, is simply the plural of the masculine singular (after the nominal formation), but the feminine, instead of being based on the singular feminine, is derived (except in Hebrew and Mehri) from a feminine of the masculine singular; for, from a comparison of the Assyrian (*iktuba*), the Aramaic (*nektebon*), and the Aethiopic (*yektebā*) it appears that the Arabic *yaktub.na* is for *yaktubāna*, the plural of a feminine singular *yaktubat*, of the existence of which, however, there is no other trace. Yet the possibility of some such vanished form we must admit, in order to account for the existing plural feminine. Hebrew and Mehri are peculiar in having initial *t* instead of *y*, (Hebrew *tiktob.nā*, Mehri *tenḥaên**), that is, in forming the plural feminine directly from the singular feminine, which is apparently a more regular process than that of the other dialects. It could be considered a doubling of the feminine sign only in case the singular *taktubu* were proved to be essentially feminine, the doubtfulness of which has been referred to above. The second person plural is made regularly by forming masculine and feminine plurals of the singular *taktubu*, on the prefix of which see above. The *na* of the first plural *naktubu* is the last part of the pronoun *an.ah.na* (Aethiopic *nahna*, Arabic *nahnu*, Hebrew *anahnu*), though it

* H. von Maltzan, ZDMG, xxv. p. 201.

may have been employed at first in a merely general demonstrative sense. The dual presents nothing peculiar; its forms are the regular duals of the singulars *yaktubu* and *taktubu*.

The base of the imperfect is monosyllabic (in contrast with the dissyllabic perfect base), the vowel standing usually under the second radical (as *ktub*), but sometimes in certain dialects (Aethiopic, Mehri) under the first (*katb*, where a helping vowel *e* or *i* is commonly introduced under the second radical). In this case Aethiopic has differentiated the base into two uses. The monosyllabic stem seems (from comparison of infinitive and imperative) to have been connected with an abstract signification, as the dissyllabic with the concrete, and from the union of this abstract base with the prefix results a concrete noun. We naturally inquire the origin of this base and prefix. As to the base, it is better taken as an original substantive (as *ktab* = *katb*), rather than as a phonetic diminution of the longer form (*katab* or *kataba*) for easier pronunciation on the addition of the prefix. As far as we know, the forms *katb* (= *ktab*) and *katab* existed side by side from the earliest times, and whether one came from the other or the two were parallel derivatives from some simpler form, cannot now be determined (the same remark is to be made of the Aphel *aktab* and similar perfects). More exactly, the imperfect base in the simple stem (Qal) appears under the forms *ktub*, *ktib*, *ktab*, in the differences of whose vowels it is not possible to make out any clear scheme of symbolism. Of our three forms the first is (in the imperfect) commonly transitive but sometimes intransitive, the second and third commonly intransitive, but sometimes transitive; on the other hand, in the perfect the vowel-usage is nearly the reverse of this, *katab* being transitive and *katib* and *katub* intransitive. The attempt to discover symbolic meaning in the *u*, *i*, *a* is rendered still more difficult by a reference to other verbal forms: the passive perfects are marked by a persistent *u* in the first syllable (followed in Arabic by *i*), but the passive participle in the simple stem has the same sequence of vowels as the imperfect active (*maktüb*, *yaktub*), and in the derived stems is based on an *a*-form (*mu.kattab*, etc.); a similar

apparently arbitrary use of the vowels exists in the nominal forms. It is not only difficult to fix any symbolism in the vowels, but also to discover any fixed force assigned them by usage. If it be said, for example, that the simplest vowel *a* was naturally employed in a transitive sense, and then as a matter of course in the perfect the intransitive sense assigned to the remaining vowels *i*, *u*, which naturally appear also in the allied passive, it must be added that in the imperfect the use was nearly reversed, and we must conclude that the vowels occupied an indifferent position in respect to the idea of action. It would be rash to say that there was never any distinction in meaning between the three vowels, but certainly the data for its determination, if it did exist, are not now at hand; we can only hold that from various forms originally standing side by side the different dialects have made various selections, and into them introduced certain euphonic changes, according to laws not yet discovered.

The uncertainty of the origin of the prefix *ya* is seen in the diversity of the opinions held in relation to it. It appears under the forms *ya*, *yu*, *ye* (Hebrew *Shewa*), which are parallel with those of the participial preformative *ma*, *mu*, *me*; of these the third, however (*ye*), is simply a weakening of one of the other two. The second (*yu*) is found in Arabic throughout the passive and in the active of three of the derived stems (II., III., IV.), and in Assyrian apparently in nearly the same set of stems. Of a difference of meaning between *ya* and *yu* there is no clear trace. The supposition that these vowels mark different personal relations (*u* the person speaking, *a* the person spoken of), in itself precarious, is useless here. The explanation of the vowel-difference may more reasonably be sought in dissimilation (*ya* being found in some *u*-bases, *yu* in some *a*-bases, but not regularly), or in analogy (the passive *yu* may be suggested by the passive perfect *kutiba*). The force of the prefix *ya* was originally that of a simple demonstrative. On the supposition that its Assyrian form *i* is a weakening of an original *a*, it has been surmised that it was merely euphonic, introduced to facilitate the pronunciation of a word beginning with two consonants (*ktub*, and so *Aphel*

aktab for *ktab*), according to a not infrequent usage in the Shemitic languages; but, while the form of the Aphel might be thus explained, it would not be easy to account for the *ya* of the imperfect; rather, a comparison of the modern Arabic *iktub* with the ancient *yaktubu* indicates that the reverse is the case, the *i* is a weakening of *ya*. All the phonetic phenomena point to an original *ya*, as in the numerous existing nouns made by this preformative. Some light may be thrown on its meaning by reference to the analogous preformative of the participle, *ma*. This preformative is found in numerous nouns designating the place or time or instrument (*mi*) of an action, in all which the meaning may be accounted for by regarding the *ma* (= *mi*) as indicating 'place' (and so also perhaps the nominal mimation); it is natural, then, to look for the same meaning in the participial prefix, the 'place' being in this case an agent or object. Compare, for the general turn of thought, the Hebrew instrumental use of א, and the expression: "In Isaac will a seed be called to thee," that is, Isaac, as the locus of the calling, is 'the person calling,' the name-giver, the true Abrahamidae will be the Isaacidae (in distinction from the Ishmaelites). This view of the force of the *ma* does not prevent our carrying it farther back to a demonstrative identical with the interrogative-indefinite pronoun. If, now, we look for the uses of the form *ya* in Shemitic, we find it employed to denote the genitive plural (the only plural form found in Hebrew, as *sus.a.yi.k* for *susayak*, Arabic dual *rajulai.ni* = *rajula.ya.ni*), and to form relative adjectives (as 'ibri 'a Hebrew,' for 'ibri.y.ya), in both which cases the force of the affix is 'pertaining to'. It is not improbable, then, that the noun *yis.har* ('oil') signifies 'that which pertains to, belongs in the category of, is defined by shining,' *yis.haq* (Isaac) 'he who pertains to laughing,' and the imperfect *yaktubu* would mean, 'he who pertains to writing.' Perhaps in this patronymic force of the *ya* lies the reason for its frequent use in proper names. The difference in meaning between participle with *ma* and noun with *ya* would then be that the former represents a thing as agent or object of an action, while the

latter represents it as belonging to the category indicated by the base, a distinction which (as is often true of original etymological differences) amounts to little or nothing in actual use. Whether this account of *ya* be correct or not, it is plain that the imperfect form *yaktubu* belongs to the class of derivative nouns made by prefixes, and that no significance pertains to the position of the formative syllable that does not equally pertain to other prefix-forms, as, for example, in the participle. It is bare conjecture to say that, while in the perfect the postposition of the pronoun, keeping the substantive base prominent, emphasizes the action as complete, the preposition of the pronoun in the imperfect, giving it the prominent and the action the subordinate place, indicates the incomplete character of the latter. The preceding discussion of the *ya* leads us to deny its position a recognizable symbolic significance, and to seek the distinction in meaning between perfect and imperfect in differences imposed on them by usage. It is also impossible to determine the relative priority of perfect and imperfect from the form of their bases. Though the simple *kataba* may be older than the derivative *yaktubu*, it does not follow that a similar difference of age exists in the verb-forms that sprang from these. The attempt to fix the relation of age between these forms by calling the imperfect an 'aorist,' that is, an indefinite, must equally fail. It is really no more an aorist than the perfect; both are indefinite in their indication of time, their difference of signification and use has at bottom nothing to do with time, and the distinction between them must be sought elsewhere.

The base of the perfect of the Shemitic verb is not an abstract, but a concrete noun. The analogy of many agglutinating languages has been urged in proof of its abstract character, but such an argument avails little against facts of the Shemitic dialects themselves. On Shemitic ground ingenious arguments for the abstract character have been drawn from the difference in form between the pronominal affixes and the separate pronouns, and between the ordinary verb and the periphrastic Aramaean form, and from an Aethiopic infinitive construction. It is urged that the verbal affixes are

in the oblique case (the separate pronouns being nominatives), whence it is inferred that *katab.ti* = ' (act of) killing of me,' *katab.ka* (the Aethiopic being taken as the original) = 'killing of thee,' etc. But this division of Shemitic personal-pronominal forms into nominative and oblique cases is without foundation. There is no evidence that such forms as *ku*, *ki*, *ka* with case-distinctions ever existed; it is evident that in the third person *hu*', *hem* acted for all case-relations. In Hebrew, when the oblique pronoun is to be repeated emphatically, it is the separate form (as '*ani* in the first person) that is used. The suffix-pronouns are fragments or components of the separate pronouns. The relation between the difficult *t* and *k*-forms has been discussed above, and, whatever conclusion we come to concerning their origin, we must hold that they are interchangeable and equivalent. So in the Aramaic periphrastic form, which is supposed to establish a case-difference in the pronoun. The late *kotel.no* (= *kātil.na*) 'killing (am) I' is indeed very different in appearance from the ordinary first person singular *kitleth* (= *katal.ti*), not because the *no* (for *ēno* = *ani*) is nominative and the *th* (= *t* = *ti*) is genitive, but because the latter (ordinary perfect first singular) originated at a time when a first person pronoun *ti* (= *tu*) was a living word in the language, while the former (the so-called periphrastic form) came into existence when *ti* had become petrified as verbal ending and *ēno* was the only word that was felt to mean 'I.' The Aethiopic infinitive absolute (*gabir*) is adduced as an instance of the formation of a verb by the addition of suffixes to an abstract noun: thus *gabir.o* (literally 'making of him') in connected discourse signifies 'when he makes.' To make the statement complete, it should be added that this combination of abstract noun and pronoun produces not only a verb, but at the same time a conjunction—an extension of the argument that would probably be felt to be undesirable for the end proposed, but would point to the real nature of this construction: namely, this peculiar use of the Aethiopic infinitive differs very slightly from the ordinary use of the Hebrew infinitive absolute and infinitive construct, from the former in taking a suffix, from the

latter in not taking a preposition. It is attached to a verb to express some circumstance connected with the main action, and in the language of Indo-European Grammar would be termed an 'abstract accusative absolute' or 'accusative of general reference': *sam'io dangaḍa*, literally 'as to his hearing, he feared,' = 'when he heard, he feared.' The infinitive does not step outside its legitimate nominal character, and there is no question here of the formation of a verb. The form of the perfect rather leads to the conclusion that it is a concrete noun. In the simple stem (Qal) it resembles the participle rather than the infinitive, and in Hebrew verbs middle *e* and *o* is identical with the participle. If the above statement of the relation of the various forms of the personal pronouns be correct (*ani* and *ti*, *ta* and *ka*) the Aramaic periphrastic verb would point in the same direction. But apart from this, as the imperfect agrees in the form of its base with the abstract infinitive, so the perfect agrees with the concrete participle. Though there may have been at first such indefiniteness or freedom in the forms *katab* and *ktab* or *katb* that both might equally be concrete or abstract, in the present stage of the verb they have been somewhat distinctly differentiated, and have settled into their respective concrete and abstract significations. With the imperfect the case is different. It is not like the perfect a simple noun, but a derivative made by a prefix to an abstract base, whence there results a concrete noun. As has been above pointed out, each person of the imperfect is a separate compound, which is inflected as a simple noun, and each has the same concrete character as has been established for the third masculine singular, *yaktubu*. The form *katabta*, then, means literally 'writer (art) thou' (= 'thou writest'), and *kataba*, in which no pronoun is expressed, came to be equivalent to 'writer (is) he' ('he writes'). The plurals *katabu*, *katabān* = 'writers' masculine and feminine (where, as in third singular, it would be difficult to understand the abstract 'acts of writing,' or in third singular feminine *katabat* a 'feminine act of writing'); in the first and second persons the pronoun is attached to the singular form, as *katab.na*, *katab.tum*, not, as in the Aramaic periphrastic forms

kotebi.nan, *kotebi.tun*, to the plural, and = 'writer (are) we, ye,' the simpler singular being preferred in the compound, unless the final vowels have fallen out, as in the second singular masculine, and the present forms stand for original *katabū.na*, *katabū.tum*, *katabā.tunna*, where the length of the vowel makes a difficulty. In the imperfect the plural third and second are made from the singular by the nominal plural terminations, but the first person has a separate prefix, since 'we' is not the plural of 'I,' but = 'I and others.'

The traces of the nominal origin of the Shemitic verb are less obvious in the syntax than in the etymology, yet here also quite recognizable. The syntactical emphasizing of the noun-element in a language is an indication of the extent of its syntactical development, that is, of how far it has carried the differentiation of the idea of the verb, and how far the original nominal conception has lingered in the consciousness of the people. The verb—to define it according to the character it has assumed or aims at in the most highly developed languages—is a complete fusion of action and subject into a conceptional unity, in which the merely relational modifications of the action (temporal, modal and others) are represented by corresponding formal modifications; and the degree of verbal development will be felt in all those constructions in which these modifications come into play. The difference between different languages in this respect is one of degree rather than of essence; those that have the best elaborated verb yet show traces of its primitive nominal character, and it may be doubted whether there are any that fail entirely to distinguish between noun and verb. The Shemitic languages occupy an intermediate position in this respect: they distinguish clearly between verb and noun, but they sometimes emphasize the nominal element of the verb, and a clear apprehension of such cases will facilitate our understanding of the syntax and therefore of the thought of these languages.

First may be mentioned the frequent employment of the abstract noun (infinitive) where we should rather use the finite verb, a usage found in Indo-European languages, but more frequent in Hebrew and its cognate dialects. In curt

and intense discourse the infinitive absolute is employed instead of the finite verb where the subject of the affirmation is evident from the context (2 Kin. iv. 43), and in the ordinary intensive use of this infinitive, its close union with the verb is shown, for example, by the fact that in a negative assertion the negative stands before infinitive and verb. So the infinitive construct is widely used with prepositions to express relations of purpose, contemporaneousness, etc., where the construction with conjunction and finite verb or with participle is more usual in the Indo-European family of languages. It is also noticeable that this infinitive often alternates with the finite verb in discourse, as in Isa. xxxviii. 9: "In his being sick and he recovered from his sickness" = "When he had been sick and had recovered." With those constructions compare that of the Aethiopic absolute infinitive referred to above. This striking approach of the infinitive and verb has led to the discussion of the question whether the Shemitic infinitive ever transcends the nominal character,* and some writers have preferred to designate the two forms of infinitive as nominal and verbal respectively.† But this usage rather indicates that the Shemitic idea of the verb lingered in the plane of the noun; it is not that the infinitive advances towards the verb, but that Hebrew and its sister tongues sometimes prefer to treat an action as merely substantive, where we prefer to consider it as blended with its subject into a unit of thought. The bearing of this usage on the determination of the character (whether abstract or concrete) of the nominal base of the perfect has been touched on above in connection with the Aethiopic infinitive. The syntactical interchange of finite verb and infinitive might seem to point to an abstract form for the base of the perfect; it only points, however, to the possibility of such a form, and the facts above adduced show that historically the perfect has come from a participle and not from an infinitive. Add to this use of the infinitive the alternation of imperative and finite verb in discourse, the former appearing in sequence where we should

* Koch's *Der Semitische Infinitiv*.

† Dillman's *Grammatik der Aethiopischen Sprache*, p. 209.

use the latter: "I will bless thee and make thy name great, and be thou a blessing" (Gen. xii. 2). In these constructions the true sense of the language can be gotten only by treating infinitive and imperative in their proper character, not regarding them as improper substitutes for true verbs.

The next fact to be noted is the comparative abundance of neuter verbs and the corresponding paucity of adjectives in Hebrew and the related dialects. A neuter verb is the attribution of a quality to a subject, and by the prominence given to the substantive base stands nearest to the noun and farthest from the fully developed verbal idea. The language has thus thrown its adjectival conceptions into a verbal shape, and has less need to isolate them. In the Indo-European languages even the verbs called neuter set forth an act inhering in the subject ('he sleeps' means 'he performs the act of sleeping,' not 'he is asleep'), and to express simple attribution of qualities they prefer to isolate adjective and substantive verb. But the Shemitic tongues make comparatively small use of the substantive verb, which is the highest generalization of the idea of relation; wherever it is possible they set subject and predicate side by side and leave the relation to be inferred from the juxtaposition. This is the ground of their frequent use of the personal pronoun to mark or rather to call attention to relations, where in most grammars it is loosely and incorrectly said that the pronoun is used for the substantive verb. Rather, the substantive verb is ignored, and the nominal elements of the phrase placed side by side, the reader or hearer being left to discover the relation from the general connection. The phrase: *Dawid hu' ham.melek* (דָּוִד הוּא הַמֶּלֶךְ) is literally: 'David, he the king,' where the pronoun is anything but the copula. The paucity of adjectives and the infrequency of the substantive verb are thus correlative phenomena, and are both connected with the relative prominence given to the nominal idea.

In a considerable number of cases the verb in Hebrew is treated *in regimine* as a noun, standing in a distinctly substantival way after the construct state and after a preposition. A good instance of this occurs in the opening expression

of the Book of Genesis : *be.rēshith bārā' Elohim* (ברשית ברא, אלהים), where, the noun *reshith* being in the construct state, the precise form is: ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, 'in the beginning of God created,' (= 'in the beginning of the time when God created') with the verb *bara'* 'created' in the syntactical position of a noun (the same construction in Hos. i. 2). So in Isa. lxxv. 1: *nirdashti le.lo' shāālu* (נִרְדַּשְׁתִּי לִלּוֹא שְׂאִלוּ) 'I am sought by they did not ask after me,' where the phrase 'they did not ask' is governed by a preposition. In these sentences we cannot well understand merely the omission of a relative pronoun, as no doubt occurs in some relational sentences; that is, the consciousness of the language did not here supply a relative pronoun, as we often do in English in such phrases as 'the man I saw' for 'the man whom I saw.' The Hebrew distinctly defines the word 'beginning' by the word 'created'; the *bara'* still retained so much of its nominal character in the feeling of the people that it could stand where we should think a noun absolutely necessary. There is a syntactical gradation in these Hebrew relational phrases from the form with relative pronoun identical with our usage through the simpler omission of the relative to the sharply defined constructions above cited. But to regard these latter as merely consciously abridged phrases (they occur in prose as well as in poetry) is to measure Hebrew by our own standards, and to miss the statuesque nominal conception of these constructions. In the English sentence: "Letting 'I dare not' wait upon 'I would'," there is a clear consciousness that the verbs are used out of their natural position, but there is no sign of this in the Hebrew phrases in question.

Finally, the small development of temporal and modal forms in Hebrew may perhaps receive a partial explanation from the prominence of the nominal base of the verb. The Aramaic is the only one of the Shemitic dialects that has produced a tolerably clear distinction of time-forms; this came in part from its flexible and practical character (the Aramaeans were in ancient times the intermediaries between Shemitic and Indo-European culture), and partly, perhaps, from the influence of foreign modes of thought; the Shemitic languages

generally have almost no time-forms proper. The form commonly called the imperfect (by Böttcher the *Fiens*) is in the present use of Hebrew more exactly an inchoative or ingressive, marking the entering on an action; but it probably goes back finally to the general notion of incompleteness. We must assume the existence in primitive Shemitic of at least germinal modal forms; but these partly died out in Hebrew (as similar forms have disappeared from English), partly from peculiar circumstances were specially developed only in Arabic and slightly in Aethiopic. Moreover, this modal growth took place only in the imperfect, because there alone the idea of incompleteness naturally connected itself with ideas of dependence, uncertainty, etc. May it, then, not be that the distinct consciousness of the nominal base of the verb, in Shemitic generally and particularly in Hebrew, led to the development of substantival rather than modal modifications of the verbal form—to the derived stems rather than to conjunctive and optative, to forms expressing degrees of completeness rather than to tenses? The derived stems all express modes of the performance of the action itself, intensive, causal, reflexive, but not modes of existence of the action; they pertain more naturally to the contemplation of the action as a substantive thing, they express actual modifications in it, while the mood proper indicates changes, not in the act itself, but in the mode of conception of the speaker or writer. So also the distinction of completeness and its opposite is an objective quality of the action, while time is merely the sphere in which the action takes place. If such were the development of the Hebrew verb, it does not follow that all languages must have followed the same course. It is possible that some languages, emphasizing the nominal verb-base in some points, may in other points have wrought out the full idea of the verb more or less completely; each language will have its own direction of growth, as for example, Sanskrit falls far behind Greek and Latin in its modal forms, and the Vedic subjunctive was not retained in the later period of the language. So among the Shemitic languages there are various differences in the lines of growth. Hebrew has worked out a system of sequence in

verb-forms that is as fixed and often as mechanical as its time-system is defective. The phenomena of sequence (which it is not our purpose here to discuss) grow out of the signification of the perfect and imperfect, and thus, if the above view be correct, out of the distinct consciousness that the Hebrew retained of the nominal origin of its verb.

III.—On a Certain Apparently Pleonastic Use of $\omega\varsigma$.

BY FREDERIC D. ALLEN,

PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI.

In many expressions $\omega\varsigma$ seems to be used superfluously, but this is notably so in $\omega\varsigma$ ἄλλως and $\omega\varsigma$ ἐτέρως, ‘otherwise.’ Grammarians explain the origin of these phrases as best they can, generally regarding them as abbreviations of longer phrases containing a comparison. So Kühner (*Ausführliche Grammatik*, vol. ii., p. 921) says that $\omega\varsigma$ ἄλλως stands for οὕτως $\omega\varsigma$ ἄλλο ἐστίν, ‘thus as something else is’; and similarly $\omega\varsigma$ ἐτέρως. Krüger speaks to much the same effect, and so does Klotz in his *Devarius*. Liddell and Scott consider the $\omega\varsigma$ as used to “strengthen” the positive; others have thought of the exclamatory $\omega\varsigma$ in this connection (‘oh, how differently!’). In short, the whole matter is highly nebulous. Yet it is not hard to see what was probably the origin of these expressions, if only one is willing to look a little below the surface of things.

The adverbs in -ως are, as I suppose every one now knows, the old ablative singular. This case ended in Sanskrit in -at or -āt, in old Latin in *ēd* or *ōd* (feminine *ād*), and in pre-Hellenic Greek in -ωτ. This final *t*-sound, as it could not maintain itself in Greek, was either dropped (as in οὕτω, ᾧ-δε), or changed to σ (as in οὕτως, σοφῶς, δικαίως). Now these phrases $\omega\varsigma$ ἄλλως, $\omega\varsigma$ ἐτέρως, are, as I take it, nothing more or less than the ablatives of ὁ ἄλλος, ὁ ἕτερος, petrified—if one may so express